

REMARKS

The application has been reviewed in view of the final Office Action dated July 15, 2003 and the Advisory Action dated October 22, 2003. Claims 1-11 are pending in the application and presented for examination, with claims 1, 4-7, 10 and 11 being in independent form.

By this Amendment, claim 1 is being amended to clarify the claimed invention. Support for the claim amendment may be found in the application at, inter alia, page 15, lines 20-23. Accordingly, Applicant submits that no new matter is introduced.

Claims 1 and 3-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as purportedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,104,504 to Imai et al. Claims 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Imai '504 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,671,270 to Yoshida.

Applicant has carefully considered the Examiner's comments and the cited art, and respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 4-7, 10 and 11 are patentable over the cited art, for at least the following reasons.

The present application relates to facsimile communications operation using optional frames. As discussed in the application at page 3, recommendation T-30 to the Group-3 standard does not require that an optional frame be used and does not define a manner in which the optional frame must be used. While some manufacturers of such facsimile machines have agreed to a common specification on the usage of the optional frames, other manufacturers are not parties to the agreement and may produce facsimile machines that do not conform to the common specification of optional frames. There may be problems in

communications operation between a facsimile machine which adheres to the common specification of optional frames and another facsimile machine which does not adhere to the common specification.

According to this application, the risks of a communications error can be used by checking at the receiving facsimile machine the identification information of the calling facsimile machine. Performance of the facsimile communications operation using the optional frame is canceled, if the identification information of the calling facsimile machine does not correspond with prestored identification information for a plurality of different machines which have common specifications of optional frames. On the other hand, if the identification information of the calling facsimile machine corresponds to the prestored identification information, the facsimile communications operation using the optional frame is executed.

For example, independent claim 1 relates to a facsimile communication method for performing a Group 3 facsimile communications operation using an optional frame signal. The method includes providing a facsimile apparatus with a memory which prestores identification information for a plurality of different facsimile machines having common specifications of optional frames, receiving a call from a calling facsimile machine for a facsimile communications operation using an optional frame and identification information of the calling facsimile machine, comparing the identification information of the calling facsimile machine with the identification information prestored in the memory, canceling performance of the facsimile communications operation using the optional frame when the identification information of the calling facsimile machine does not

correspond with the identification information prestored in the memory, and executing the facsimile communications operation using the optional frame when the identification information of the calling facsimile machine corresponds to the identification information prestored in the memory.

Imai, as understood by Applicant, relates to a facsimile apparatus which carries out communication by using a selective polling signal (SEO) under the ITU-T T.30 Additional Recommendations. The selective polling signal can be used as a document identification number which is queued for polling in a called station.

The July 15, 2003 Office Action states that Imai discloses, at column 4, lines 8-67, providing a facsimile apparatus with a memory which prestores identification information for a plurality of different facsimile machines having common specifications of optional frames, verifying the identification information of a calling facsimile machine with the identification information prestored in the memory, canceling performance of the facsimile communications operation using the optional frame when the identification information of the calling facsimile machine does not correspond with the identification information prestored in the memory, and executing the facsimile communications operation using the optional frame when the identification information of the calling facsimile machine corresponds to the identification information prestored in the memory.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Column 4, lines 8-67 of Imai describes image designation and read operation in a selective polling procedure performed by a called station. According to Imai, the image type number designated in the

received selective polling signal is compared to the images stored in a memory box. If there is a match, the matched image is retrieved from the image box. If there is not a match as between the designated image type and the stored images, normal polling (as opposed to selective polling is performed).

However, Imai does not purport to relate to prestoring identification information for a plurality of different facsimile machines having common specifications of optional frames, nor verifying the identification information of a calling facsimile machine with the prestored identification information corresponding to the plurality of different facsimile machines having common specifications of optional frames (in order to confirm whether the calling facsimile machine follows the common specification).

While Imai discloses comparing a designated image type number to images stored in a memory box (in order to decide whether one of the images matches and therefore can be retrieved), Imai simply does not teach or suggest comparing the identification information of the calling facsimile machine on the one hand and on the other hand prestored identification information for a plurality of different machines which have common specifications of optional frames.

Yoshida, as understood by Applicant, relates to a facsimile communications procedure for transmitting a subaddress signal, a password signal and a selective polling signal. According to Yoshida, the transmitting station transmits a digital transmit command signal to notify the receiving station whether the transmit command signal includes the password signal and the selective polling signal. A digital command signal is used to notify a remote station whether the

receive command signal includes the password signal and subaddress signal.

The July 15, 2003 Office Action states that Yoshida discloses, at column 11, line 6 through column 12, line 64, providing a facsimile apparatus with a memory which prestores identification information for a plurality of different facsimile machines having common specifications of optional frames, and verifying the identification information of a calling facsimile machine with the identification information prestored in the memory.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

According to Yoshida, a password signal (PWD) is transmitted between a transmitting station and a receiving station in accordance with the T.30 Additional Recommendations. As pointed out in the application at pages 1-2, the frame PWD in a selective polling mode is a signal for indicating that the following facsimile information field represents a password for allowing entrance to a selective polling mode.

However, Yoshida does not purport to relate to prestoring identification information for a plurality of different facsimile machines having common specifications of optional frames, nor verifying the identification information of a calling facsimile machine with the prestored identification information corresponding to the plurality of different facsimile machines having common specifications of optional frames (in order to confirm whether the calling facsimile machine follows the common specification).

Applicant finds no disclosure or suggestion by the cited art of a facsimile communication method for performing a facsimile

communications operation using an optional frame signal which includes providing a facsimile apparatus with a memory which prestores identification information for a plurality of different facsimile machines having common specifications of optional frames, receiving a call from a calling facsimile machine for a facsimile communications operation using an optional frame and identification information of the calling facsimile machine, comparing the identification information of the calling facsimile machine with the identification information prestored in the memory, canceling performance of the facsimile communications operation using the optional frame when the identification information of the calling facsimile machine does not correspond with the identification information prestored in the memory, and executing the facsimile communications operation using the optional frame when the identification information of the calling facsimile machine corresponds to the identification information prestored in the memory, as provided by independent claim 1.

Since the cited references do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention, they do not render the claimed invention unpatentable.

Independent claims 4-7, 10 and 11 are patentably distinct from the cited art for at least similar reasons.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-11 are allowable, and this application is now in condition for allowance.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required in connection with this response and to credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this

Shigetaka TANAKA, S.N. 09/317,069
Page 14


Dkt. 2271/59262

response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition, and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite fees to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


PAUL TENG, Reg. No. 40,837
Attorney for Applicant
Cooper & Durham LLP
Tel.: (212) 278-0400